

Application No. 10/776,538  
Amendment dated July 2, 2007  
Reply to Office Action of April 12, 2007

Docket No.: 3722-0177PUS1

## REMARKS

Claims 1-10 remain present in this application.

Claims 1, 5, 6 and 10 have been amended. Reconsideration of the application, as amended, is respectfully requested. The orders of the steps in the amended claims can be easily known according to the original description and drawings. So, no new matter is added.

### Rejections under 35 USC 102 and 103

Claims 1-5 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Eric L. Andersen et al. (U.S. Patent 6,646,768). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The '768 patent states:

After pushing a "start" button, located, for example, on the user interface unit 25, one or more input pick-up and conveying rollers (not shown) feed pages of the document 49 one by one from the input tray 17 and convey the pages over and past the ADF scan window 43 where each page of the document is scanned by the stationary image sensor assembly 33. (see col. 6, lines 21-27)

Since the document is still moving, the relative movement between the moving document and the stationary image sensor assembly 33 still exists. Thus, the '768 patent does not really teaches to make the document and the scan module relatively stationary to each other. In fact, the prior art does not discuss the microscopic condition. For example, if a first person on a moving car takes a first photograph (at point A) and a second photograph (at point B) when the car moves from the point A to the point B, and a second person on a stationary car stopped at the point A takes a third photograph, and then the second person takes a fourth photograph after the car moves to the

Docket No.: 3722-0177PUS1

Application No. 10/776,538  
Amendment dated July 2, 2007  
Reply to Office Action of April 12, 2007

point B and stops at the point B, one of ordinary skill in the art may easily understand that the quality of the third paragraph is better than that of the first paragraph and the quality of the fourth paragraph is better than that of the second paragraph.

Consequently, the '768 patent does not teach that the step (b) of "stabilizing the movement of one of the document and the scan module and consequently making the document and the scan module relatively stationary to each other" is performed after the step (a) of "moving one of a document and a scan module by a predetermined distance from the other." Also, the '768 patent does not teach that the step (c) of "illuminating the document with light rays from a light source, and receiving a stable image signal of the document by utilizing an image sensor of the scan module" is performed after the step (b) of "stabilizing the movement of one of the document and the scan module and consequently making the document and the scan module relatively stationary to each other." In fact, the '768 patent does not stabilize the movement of one of the document and the scan module and consequently make the document and the scan module relatively stationary to each other until the document has been scanned. If the document has been scanned in step (b), it is unnecessary to perform the step (c) to illuminate the document.

Consideration of the rejection to the claim 1 and its dependent claims 2-5 are therefore politely requested.

Regarding to the amended claim 5, the '768 patent does not teach the order of steps (b1), (c1) and (d1). If the document is manually positioned on the glass plate (col. 3, line 55), in step (c1), the step (b1) should be performed after step (c1) according to the '768 patent.

Application No. 10/776,538  
Amendment dated July 2, 2007  
Reply to Office Action of April 12, 2007

Docket No.: 3722-0177PUS1

Claims 6-10 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being anticipated by Eric L. Andersen et al. (U.S. Patent 6,646,768) in combination with Kikuo Mita (U.S. Patent 5,149,977). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The '768 patent states:

After pushing a "start" button, located, for example, on the user interface unit 25, one or more input pick-up and conveying rollers (not shown) feed pages of the document 49 one by one from the input tray 17 and convey the pages over and past the ADF scan window 43 where each page of the document is scanned by the stationary image sensor assembly 33. (see col. 6, lines 21-27)

Since the document is still moving, the relative movement between the moving document and the stationary image sensor assembly 33 still exists. Thus, the '768 patent does not really teach to make the document and the scan module relatively stationary to each other. In fact, the prior art does not discuss the microscopic condition. For example, if a first person on a moving car takes a first photograph (at point A) and a second photograph (at point B) when the car moves from the point A to the point B, and a second person on a stationary car stopped at the point A takes a third photograph, and then the second person takes a fourth photograph after the car moves to the point B and stops at the point B, one of ordinary skill in the art may easily understand that the quality of the third photograph is better than that of the first photograph and the quality of the fourth photograph is better than that of the second photograph.

Consequently, the '768 and '977 patents do not teach that the step (c) of "stabilizing the movement of one of the document and the scan module and consequently making the document and the scan module relatively stationary to each other, and receiving a stable image signal of the

Docket No.: 3722-0177PUS1

Application No.10/776,538  
Amendment dated July 2, 2007  
Reply to Office Action of April 12, 2007

document by utilizing the image sensor of the scan module" is performed after the step (b) of "moving one of the document and a scan module by a predetermined distance from the other, and at the same time discarding an unstable image signal of the document by utilizing an image sensor of the scan module."

Also, the '768 and '977 patents do not teach that "moving one of the document and a scan module by a predetermined distance from the other" and "discarding an unstable image signal of the document by utilizing an image sensor of the scan module" at the same time. In fact, the '977 patent teaches that:

1. the complete document image is acquired by the light receiving section 42 in step 500;
2. the image data is then stored in a first image data storage means 84 in step 502; and
3. the image quality is judged in parallel with the image reader in step 504.

If the judged image quality is poor, the image data stored in the memory is erased (see col. 6, lines 31-54). Thus, "moving one of the document and a scan module by a predetermined distance from the other" and "discarding an unstable image signal of the document by utilizing an image sensor of the scan module" are not performed at the same time.

Also, the '977 patent does not teach "discarding an unstable image signal of the document by utilizing an image sensor of the scan module" because the image signal is still obtained by the image sensor and the image sensor has converted the image signal into the "image data" which may be stored to the memory. So, the image sensor in the '977 patent does not discard any image signal and the image data is erased in the memory. Consideration of the rejection to the claim 6 and its dependent claims 7-10 are therefore politely requested.

Docket No.: 3722-0177PUS1

Application No. 10/776,538  
Amendment dated July 2, 2007  
Reply to Office Action of April 12, 2007

Regarding to the amended claim 10, the '768 and '977 patents do not teach the order of steps (b1), (c1) and (d1). If the document is manually positioned on the glass plate (col. 3, line 55), in step (c1), the step (b1) should be performed after step (c1) according to the '768 patent and '977 patent.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the prior art utilized by the Examiner fails to teach or suggest the connector of independent claim 1, as well as its dependent claims. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 USC 102 and 103 rejections are respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Favorable reconsideration and an early Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

In the event that any outstanding matters remain in this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (703) 205-8000 in the Washington, D.C. area.

Application No. 10/776,538  
Amendment dated July 2, 2007  
Reply to Office Action of April 12, 2007

Docket No.: 3722-0177PUS1

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: July 2, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Joe McKinney Muney

Registration No.: 32,334

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH &amp; BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant